HW



PATENT Attorney Docket No.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor

Thomas R. Hetzel and Joseph S. Bieganek

Serial No.

10/628,858

Filed

July 28, 2003

Title :

INDIVIDUALLY-CONTOURED SEAT CUSHION AND

SHAPE CAPTURING AND FABRICATING METHOD FOR

SEAT CUSHION

Group Art Unit

1771

Confirmation No.

3846

Examiner

Victor S. Chang

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The undersigned hereby certifies that the attached Response to Restriction Requirement; Certificate of Mailing by First Class Mail; and Return Card, relating to the above application, were deposited as "First Class Mail," with the United States Postal Service, addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 24th day of June, 2005.

____(Q k

Mailer

Data

John R./Ley '/

Registration Nol. 27,453

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

Customer No. 28785

JOHN R. LEY, LLC

5299 DTC Boulevard, Suite 610

Greenwood Village, Colorado 80111-3327

Telephone: (303) 740-9000 Facsimile: (303) 740-9042



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Thomas R. Hetzel and Joseph S. Bieganek

Serial No. : 10/628,858 Filed : July 28, 2003

Title : INDIVIDUALLY-CONTOURED SEAT CUSHION AND

SHAPE CAPTURING AND FABRICATING METHOD FOR

SEAT CUSHION

Group Art Unit

1771

Confirmation No.

3846

Examiner

Victor S. Chang

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Mail Stop Amendments
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the office action mailed June 15, 2005, in which a restriction requirement was made between claims 1-56, 58, 59 and 66-77 on one hand and claims 57 and 60-65 on the other hand, the applicant, by and through its undersigned attorney, hereby elects claims 1-56, 58, 59 and 66-77 for further prosecution in this application. The election is made with traverse.

While the claims of the two groups are related by method and apparatus, it is believed that the details of the apparatus recited in claims 57 and 60-65 are sufficiently closely related to the details of the method recited in the elected group of claims, that all the claims should be examined simultaneously. For example, compare claims 39 and 59 with claim 61. Economy in procedure will be obtained because it will be necessary to search subject matter relevant to both groups of claims when examining the elected group of claims. The references cited during the examination may be applicable to both sets of claims.

For these and other reasons it is respectfully requested that all claims be examined simultaneously.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/24/05 By:

John R. Ley

Registration No. 2/7,453

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

JOHN R. LEY, LLC

5299 DTC Boulevard, Suite 610

Greenwood Village, CO 80111-3321

Telephone: (303) 740-9000 Facsimile: (303) 740-9042